

To: Chairman Todd Hunter, Chair, House Committee on State Affairs Members, House Committee on State Affairs Cyrus Reed, Sierra Club, <u>cyrus.reed@sierraclub.org</u>, 512-740-4086 March 31st, 2023

During our testimony for and against various bills on Wednesday, March 29th, we failed to mention several bills or approaches that we believe could get additional resources - on the demand and supply side - into the Texas market to help meet adequacy without the need for a massive gas buildout, state-financing of dispatchable generation, a specific carve-out for gas or a PCM. This is a very quick list of potential solutions that the Sierra Club does support to help our resilience and reliability. Several of these have been filed as separate bills. By Monday, I will be providing additional thoughts on how to improve the bills filed by Chairman Hunter and Rep. Shelby.

| Category                                    | Bill Number or<br>Program                      | Estimated Amount   | Note   |
|---|--|--|--|
| Adding an Ancillary<br>Service such as DRRS | HB 4832 (Hunter) /SB<br>7 (Schwertner)         | Estimate are that it is<br>in the range of 3,000 -<br>5,000 MWs of<br>dispatchable<br>resources would be<br>supported by added<br>DRRS | Based on IMM and<br>TAM estimates. Sierra<br>Club favors many<br>aspects of SB 7,<br>including the DRRS<br>though we believe<br>there should be no<br>more than a 4-hour<br>duration requirement<br>and are concerned by<br>the expensive firming<br>requirements. |
| Increasing Energy<br>Efficiency Goals       | HB 4784 (Anchia) bill<br>and SB 258 (Eckhardt) | We estimate that<br>establishing a 1<br>percent goal would<br>reduce demand by<br>2,428,709 MWh by                                     | The MWh goal<br>calculation is based<br>on calculations from<br>Frontier Associates;<br>the MW reduction   |

What are some ways to help reduce demand, or increase resources for resource adequacy?

|  |  | 2027 and would<br>likely reduce peak<br>demand from the<br>current level of about<br>600 MWs to 1,200<br>MWs by 2027  | assumes the<br>quadrupling of energy<br>efficiency KWhs goals<br>would increase would<br>also reduce peak<br>demand by twice<br>current levels.  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Establishing a<br>Demand Response<br>requirement for<br>winter and summer<br>residential loads | HB 4784 (Anchia) SB<br>114 (Menendez)            | A 5% goal for<br>residential summer<br>and winter peak<br>within ERCOT should<br>reduce demand by<br>approximately 2,000<br>MWs in the summer,<br>and 1,800 MWs by<br>2027            | Winter load peaks are<br>in the 35,000 MW<br>range for residential<br>and 40,000 MW<br>range for summer<br>peaks.  |
| Raising the overall<br>building code for the<br>state to the 2021<br>energy (IECC) code        | HB 3312 (Hernandez)<br>and SB 2453<br>(Menendez) | 400 MW reduction by<br>2027   | The 2021 code is<br>5-8% more energy<br>efficient but only<br>impacts new<br>construction and<br>rebuilds  |
| Help customers pay<br>bills/weatherize<br>homes  | HB 3078 (Hernandez)<br>HB 4099 (Bonnen)          | Create a low-income<br>discount and<br>weatherization<br>programs; help<br>customers pay back<br>winter storm uri<br>securitized bills  | Setting aside money<br>from the surplus or<br>rainy day fund to help<br>customers pay back<br>securitized debts or<br>weatherize homes<br>would help<br>consumers  |
| Emergency Response<br>Service  | Existing PUC-ERCOT<br>program                    | 1,000 MWs current<br>for winter and<br>summer peak seasons<br>- could be doubled<br>easily to 2,000 MWs<br>with a slight budget<br>increase from \$75<br>million to \$150<br>million. | Currently,<br>approximately 1,000<br>MWs of demand<br>response and backup<br>generation is used in<br>ERS for EEA events,<br>based on an annual<br>budget of \$75 million<br>with the option to go<br>to the \$100 million<br>cap. |
| Distributed Energy<br>Resource Integration   | HB 3387 (Hunter)<br>and SB 1699                  | Current pilot program<br>is to integrate 80   | ERCOT estimates in 2021 there are  |

|                                       | (Johnson) and HB<br>3239 (Hernandez)      | MWs but there are<br>potentially 3,000 to<br>6,000 MWs of DG<br>that could be<br>integrated and<br>provide services and<br>energy  | currently 1,972 MWs<br>of "unregistered" DG<br>on the system as well<br>as 1,000 MWs of<br>Settlement Only DG<br>and another 600<br>MWs of Distribution<br>Generation<br>Resources already<br>providing ancillary<br>services. We expect<br>those numbers to<br>more than double in<br>the next few years. |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Resilience Backup                     | HB 973 (Zweiner)                          | No number but the<br>bill would create a<br>fund to support<br>backup power and<br>demand response for<br>water, wastewater<br>and other power<br>needs                            | Could lead to<br>thousands of MWs of<br>backup power, and<br>demand response,<br>making load shed<br>much less likely for<br>key facilities  |
| Texas Energy<br>Efficiency Council    | HB 4811 (Anchia); SB<br>2404 (Schwertner) | While the bill won't<br>directly lead to more<br>MWs of demand, it<br>would authorize<br>cooperation between<br>state agencies,<br>utilities and federal<br>funding opportunities. | With potentially more<br>than \$1 billion<br>available to Texas<br>from the federal<br>government to<br>provide loans, rebates<br>and grants for energy<br>efficiency, along with<br>utility programs we<br>could see thousands<br>of MWs of reductions<br>in the next 5 years.                            |
| Take advantage of<br>federal funding  | HB 2502 (Reynolds)<br>HB 3061 (Zwiener)   | IIJA and IRA monies<br>can be allocated to<br>SECO to provide<br>low-interest loans and<br>grants to energy<br>efficiency and<br>distributed<br>technologies.                      | Some \$1 billion could<br>be coming to SECO<br>for energy efficiency<br>and distributed<br>technologies - we<br>should take<br>advantage   |
| A Dispatchable<br>Generation Goal (1) | HB 4836 (Hunter)                          | Create a<br>technologically  | While we don't like<br>HB 4836 (or SB 2015)  |

|        | agnostic specific<br>dispatchable goal,<br>such as 5,000 MWs by<br>2027 or 10,000 MWs<br>by 2032 | since they pit gas<br>against renewables,<br>they could be<br>rewritten to support a<br>specific dispatchable<br>goal.   |
|--------|--|--|
| Totals | 8,000 - 25,000 range   | These are very rough<br>estimates, but we<br>think distributed and<br>demand-side<br>solutions could<br>deliver approximately<br>10,000 MWs of<br>dispatchable demand<br>reduction and<br>potentially more by<br>2027, and much more<br>if we also had a<br>dispatchable goal. |

(1) While the Sierra Club does not believe that a Dispatchable Generation Goal is needed in our market, it would be a preferable option to state-financed gas plants, or pitting dispatchable against non-dispatchable. Setting a portfolio standard for dispatchable generation with a trading program would be a market-based approach to obtaining more dispatchable generation without impacting current or future resources.